UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/849,318	05/19/2004	Paul Gassoway	063170.7177	5789
5073 BAKER BOTT	7590 06/03/200 S L.L.P.	EXAMINER		
2001 ROSS AV	ENUE	LOUIE, OSCAR A		
SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 7	75201-2980	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2436	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/03/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/849,318	GASSOWAY, PAUL		
Examiner	Art Unit		
OSCAR A. LOUIE	2436		

	OSCAN A. LOUIE	2430	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>18 May 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra transfer of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	`	ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	**		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying the	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reid	acted claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	offesporiding flumber of finally reju	scied ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inpliant Amenament (1 10L-32+).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be aller		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owabie ii submitted iii a separate,	unicly filed afficianter	it carreening the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-24</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. \square The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Displaying Statement(s) 		n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	r 1 0/30/00/ raper 110(s)		
/Nasser G Moazzami/	/O. A. L./		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436	Examiner, Art Unit 2436		
	•		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

- The applicant's arguments with respect to "the confidence levels of Nakae correspond to the IP address of the received data packet" and "these multiple confidence levels for the multiple sources of recevied data fail to teach, disclose, or suggest determining an initial system certainty value for the computer system" and "the confidence level associated with the source of the received data not a system certainty value" have been carefully considered but are non-persuasive; the examiner notes that the current claim language is broad enough to read on the cited prior art, because the "confidence levels" can be seen as a reflection of the level of "system certainty" with respect to a corresponding IP address, thereby providing the same functional indication of "trust";
- The applicant's arguments with respect to "Nakae fails to disclose, teach, or suggest increasing the system certainty value if the received data does not match a signature in the database and decreasing the system certainty value if the received data matches a signature" and "there is no teaching, disclosure, or suggestion that this determination is based on signatures...fails to disclose or suggest decreasing the system certainty value if the received data matches a signature" and "Nakae decreases a confidence level for individual IP addresses whenever an attack is detected, and there is no disclosure or suggestion that this occurs because data either matches or does not match a signature" have been carefully considered but are non-persuasive; the examiner notes that signatures are merely a representation of information (i.e. IP address, packet headers, ports, etc.) that either alone or in some combination are to be determined as an attack or not by the IDS; thus, an IP address can be seen as a specific piece of information that is part of a signature or is the signature itself in terms of the information that is being analyzed as an attack or not based on a match.